

# FEDERATION OF THE EMPIRE.

AN ADDRESS BEFORE THE

UNIVERSITY LITERARY SOCIETY,

BY

ARCH. MCGOUN, JR., B.A., B.C.L.,

PRESIDENT OF THE SOCIETY,

AT ITS 22ND PUBLIC MEETING, HELD IN THE WILLIAM MOLSON HALL,  
MCGILL UNIVERSITY, ON THE 18TH NOVEMBER, 1884.



MONTREAL:

DAWSON BROTHERS, PUBLISHERS.

1884.

F5012  
1884  
M146



*The* EDITH and LORNE PIERCE  
COLLECTION of CANADIANA



*Queen's University at Kingston*



*Purchased for the Lorne Pierce Collection  
at Queen's University on the  
Edith Chown Pierce Trust*

## FEDERATION OF THE EMPIRE.

The twenty-second public meeting of the University Literary Society was held in the William Molson Hall, McGill College, on Tuesday, the 18th November, 1884, when there was a large attendance of the members of the Society and their friends. On the platform were Sir William Dawson, Principal of McGill University; Rev. Dr. Cornish, Professor of Classical Literature; and Mr. Alex. G. Cross, Vice-President of the Society. The President, Mr. Arch. McGoun, Jr., delivered the following address:

Members of the University Literary Society, Ladies and Gentlemen—I cannot but feel that it is a distinguished honour for me to address this meeting in the halls of old McGill. My first duty is to thank my fellow-members for their confidence shown in electing me to the highest office in their gift. It is difficult to find words to express the pride and affection I feel and have ever felt in and for the University Literary Society. I have also to thank the Principal, Sir William Dawson, for honouring us with his presence on the platform to-night. This is the first meeting for many years the Society has held in the college buildings, and it will be a source of satisfaction to me that during my term of office closer relations shall have been established between the Society and our *Alma Mater*. To you, ladies and gentlemen, I extend the Society's cordial welcome. I am not so vain as to imagine that your presence is due to myself. I believe you are drawn by sympathy for the objects of the Society, respect and veneration for the University with which we are connected, and, perhaps, interest in the grand subject I have chosen for my address. Without further preface, I shall proceed to consider this subject of a Federation of the Empire.

About seven or eight years ago, when I was a law student, a number of young men organized, in an old hall near the foot of Bleury street, an amateur Parliament, in which I was a member of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition. After defeating what it is hardly necessary to say was an effete and corrupt administration, our party took office, and as a Minister of the Crown, I had the honour of introducing a resolution in the following terms:

Resolved, That an address be presented to Her Majesty in Council, declaring that, in the opinion of this House, a Royal Commission should be appointed, consisting of representatives from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and from each of the self-governing colonies, to consider and report upon the best means of securing a Federation of the Empire.

It would be tedious to follow out all the fortunes of this humble address. Suffice it to say that Her Majesty never appointed a Royal Commission, and it has remained for us to do the work over again. Later still, it was my privilege to read a paper before this Society on "The Canadian Aspect of Imperial Federation," which gave rise to a debate extending over three Friday nights, and resulted in a fourfold division of the members, among supporters of Imperial Federation, of the preservation of the present condition of things, of Independence, and of Annexation, the last receiving the support of one honourable member. In the discussions that took place on those occasions, the champions of the cause I shall attempt to lay before you this evening, laboured under a disadvantage. We were told that the English people cared nothing about Federation, and cared but little for their colonies; that no Englishman had ever broached a scheme that offered any inducement to the colonies to examine the question. Indeed it was asserted that our ideas were in antagonism to the professed principles of the leading public men in the mother country. We were told, moreover, that however strong our position might be regarding the sentiment of the people throughout the Empire, our arguments were less conclusive in dealing with the material interests of the people of Canada. Happily I am now in a position to bring the matter before you upon a more satisfactory footing than ever before, many of the most distinguished practical statesmen of England having fairly set the agitation afloat, and a member of the British Association having presented a scheme from an economic standpoint that appears to remove the most serious difficulties. I trust now that the agitation will never cease until some practical shape shall be given to it.

In the celebrated report of the Earl of Durham on the condition of British North America, in 1840, a passage occurs that seems to foreshadow something of this kind, while indicating that the problem had already impressed itself upon the mind of that great statesman. "I am of opinion," he wrote, "that the full establishment of Responsible Government can only be permanently secured by giving to these colonies an increased importance in the politics of the Empire." Great advances have been made since his day, but the words are still in a great measure true. I for one cannot say that I have any very great fault to find with the present political constitution of our country. But the law of nature is the necessity of growth; and it is easy to discern that some time in the future a further constitutional change must come. As, therefore, it is the part of a prudent man to prepare for the future stages of his life, so it is the duty of a nation to consider what development her institutions are susceptible of, in order that she may shape her course accordingly.

In trying to map out this future there are, I think, two ideas that must have an important bearing upon it. One of these is our people's pride in their connexion with the British Empire. This is



a sentiment so uniformly existing in the mind of our fellow countrymen in whatever part of the globe they are to be found, that it is deserving of a large amount of consideration. I do not say that it must be the sole determining influence upon our destiny, but I do say that any scheme of national life that fails to take account of it is an incomplete scheme, and one that cannot be realized without destroying much that is noblest in our lives. To ignore such a sentiment is as futile as to construct a system of religion or philosophy without taking account of the soul.

Co-existent with this, however, there is another sentiment, the germ of which is in every British breast. This is love of liberty, a desire for independence, an aspiration after all the attributes of national manhood. In her internal affairs, Canada already enjoys almost complete autonomy; she has acquired by precedent even the right to negotiate her own commercial treaties. But her national powers are not fully attained; and there is no patriotic Canadian, at all events in the younger generation, who is not convinced that in one form or another this must come.

Now there is only one way in which satisfaction can be given to these two aspirations. It is by a plan under which full national powers shall be acquired and the integrity of the Empire preserved, or,—to speak of it in business language,—by a national partnership, in which the mother country and the other self-governing colonies will join. This is the conviction entertained by those whom I may name the British school, at whose head I think may be placed Sir A. T. Galt, and Principal Grant, of Kingston. And it is a significant fact that one who, like Sir A. T. Galt, has always held strong views on the necessity of full national powers for Canada, should have come to the conclusion that these can be best obtained by a consolidation of the Empire. Mr. Blake has also several times spoken in favour of Imperial Federation. This will be the historical successor of the political school of the departed statesmen, Joseph Howe, Robert Baldwin and George Brown. Mr. Baldwin wrote in 1849, "I could look only upon those who are in favour of the continuance of the connexion with the mother country as political friends, those who are against it as political opponents. . . . It is not a question upon which compromise is possible." Mr. Mackenzie and Mr. Mowat represent the same principle among the Liberals to-day, while the whole political life of Sir John Macdonald and of Sir Charles Tupper have been faithful to it throughout. In fact, every public man who has ever conquered and retained the confidence of the people of Canada has been imbued with the same idea.

There is, however, another school antagonistic to this, whose chief exponent is Mr. Goldwin Smith, which may be called the American Continental School. The latter may be said to embrace also those who look for Independence in the sense of cutting ourselves adrift from the Empire, because, if such Independence be brought about, it will be with the view of establishing a nation more or less under the ægis of the Republic to our South, in furtherance

of the American Continental idea, and in antagonism to what they name the European "system," and to Great Britain as supposed to belong to that system.

Now there is a great deal of nonsense talked about this Continental idea. It is sought to be impressed upon us that because we live on the continent of America, we must snap every chord that unites us in sympathy and intercourse with the rest of the world. In my humble opinion that is a narrow and false notion. I believe that civilization will be retarded, the universal brotherhood of man, the federation of the world, indefinitely postponed, if the people of this continent determine to isolate themselves from the great nations of Europe. The closer the intimacy between the two continents, the greater will be the enlightenment of our people, the quicker the dispelling of barbarous and unworthy ideas about the common interests of humanity. What we want is not to shut ourselves out from intercourse and sympathy with the continent from which our ancestors came, but to maintain close and friendly relations with them, endeavouring, by association, to adopt the best ideas of European civilization. Notwithstanding the enormous rapidity of the development of wealth on this continent, Europe still leads the world in civilization,—in literature, art, science, philosophy and religion. Mr. Mowat, the Premier of Ontario, at the recent meeting in London, in furtherance of the idea of Imperial Federation, stated it as his opinion that the connexion between the mother country and Canada has been of unmixed benefit to our country. In this I heartily concur. But I think we should have close relations, not with England alone, but with all European nations, and especially with France. We cannot forget that a large and important section of our people have for France the same affection and regard that we have for the United Kingdom; and on this account as well as on many others, we should try to tighten, rather than to sever, the bonds that unite us to the old world. And in spite of the friction that occasionally arises between the two countries, England and France are to-day as they have been for the last century in the van of civilization. And having lived in France, and come in contact with her people, I state it as my firm conviction, that the French Canadians and all Canadians will be elevated, enlightened and ennobled by cultivating the closest relations with *la mère patrie*.

The continental idea is therefore an illiberal one; and it assumes a diversity that does not exist. England, so far as I can observe, has more affinity with this continent than with the European. Her language, her laws, her political institutions are either reproduced or closely copied throughout this continent. Even her land tenure which differs from ours, differs still more widely from that of every leading European nation. In short except in geographical situation, the United Kingdom is more closely allied to America than to Europe. England indeed is rather cosmopolitan, her interests lie in every quarter of the globe; her chief European interest is simply to preserve unrestricted communication with her Asiatic and

African colonies. For all practical purposes, water brings countries closer together than land. For intelligence distance is totally annihilated. There are already eight cables in operation between this continent and the European, and a number of others projected, while there are two in use between England and Australia.

It is indeed my heartfelt desire that we continue to preserve the warmest and kindest relations with the nation of the United States, but I think ladies will understand that it ought to be quite possible to live on the best of terms with the gentleman next door, without being bound to marry him. In the same way, while we are the best of friends with Brother Jonathan, we do not wish, for the sake of enjoying his friendship, to shut our doors against all our other friends, and particularly against our own father and mother and all our other brothers and sisters.

There are some men of large hearts and wide sympathies, who desire to see the whole Anglo-Saxon race united in one great commonwealth. While I have every sympathy with this idea, and while I should be glad to admit the United States into the federation I shall propose, I cannot think that the proper way to set about achieving that end is by severing the ties that already exist between the members of the British Empire situated the wide world over. But there are also men who hope to prevent a perfectly practicable union by pretending to work for a wider one that is altogether visionary.

Assuming then that it is desirable to maintain our connexion with other parts of the Empire, I shall now endeavour to indicate the kind of connexion that I think can be established, or to sketch the machinery of a Federation of the Empire. It is with some hesitation that I venture to submit a plan that is tolerably specific, and may be new in some of its features. My only apology will be that it is not hastily considered, but has been thought out with as much care as I could give to the consideration of so vast a subject. In speaking of this, Scotchman as I am, (*quoique avant tout je sois Canadien*), I shall use the word English to express what relates to the United Kingdom, reserving the word British for its wider meaning as relating to the whole British Empire.

It is the belief of every intelligent statesman in the United Kingdom, that some change will have to be made in the government the British Isles, by which Parliament may be relieved of some of its duties. Local Legislatures will be created, subordinate to the Central Parliament, but with somewhat extensive powers. Thus only can Home Rule be given to Ireland. The English Parliament will then be free to deal with matters relating to the joint interests of the three kingdoms, and of the colonies that are not self-governing. For these purposes which constitute the bulk of its important business, the present parliament should be left as it is; subject only to the restrictions I shall mention, which should apply also to the colonial legislatures. The Canadian Parliament, as well as the English, would be left with pretty much all the prerogatives



it now enjoys. It would continue to legislate on its present subjects of legislation, but in matters relating to other parts of the Empire, and to foreign countries, its action would be subject to ratification by the Imperial Parliament, whose functions I am about to mention. The Canadian Parliament would therefore retain for Canada all the powers the English Parliament would retain for the United Kingdom, and would deal with the common interests of the Canadian Provinces in the same way as the English Parliament with the common interests of the three kingdoms. It would recognise Imperial control only in the same measure as the English. So with Australia. A federal union, we know, must soon be effected between the Australian colonies, and to this legislature I should leave the same autonomy as will be enjoyed by Canada and by the United Kingdom. British Africa and other colonies might be brought in, as circumstances dictated. As for India, I should leave it at first, as at present, under the direction of the United Kingdom.

In addition to these there would be formed an Imperial British Parliament, with supreme authority regarding—First, Relations between the different parts of the Empire, Secondly, The ratification of Treaties with foreign Powers, Thirdly, Diplomatic and Consular services, and Fourthly, The maintenance and control of the Army and Navy. Each member of the federation,—England, Canada, Australia,—might negotiate special treaties with foreign powers, such as for Canada those relating to the fisheries, or to the extradition of criminals, but always subject to ratification by the supreme British Parliament. As these Imperial functions, and especially the maintenance of the Army and Navy, and of the diplomatic and consular services, would demand a revenue, the Imperial Parliament should have power to tax either all parts of the Empire uniformly, or by special assessment any particular part that was receiving particular benefit from the operation of those services; uniformly let us say, to keep the army and navy upon a peace footing, and by special assessment, in case of a war that affected some parts of the Empire and not others.

The membership of this Parliament would consist, in the first place, of entire membership of the English House of Commons. And the reason is that the ancient House of Commons would not be altogether disposed to respect the authority or to acquiesce in the jurisdiction of a body less numerous than itself, but would be apt to treat a smaller house merely as one of its own Committees; whereas if the whole house was or could be present at its deliberations, they could not complain of its usurpation of authority. The number of members in that House is now 658; namely 463 for England, 30 for Wales, 105 for Ireland, and 60 for Scotland. If on the passing of the Redistribution bill, that number be altered, it will be a question of simple proportion to readjust the colonial membership. Secondly, in the ideal house, I think all the members of the Parliaments of the several branches of the federation should be *ipso facto* members of the Imperial. But in the case of the



colonies, there would be two inconveniences in the way of sending their entire representation ; one, that their numbers would have to be reduced, so as to bear to the population of their respective countries the same ratio as the English house does to the population of the United Kingdom ; in the case of Canada, from 211 to 81. The other objection is that it might be difficult for the entire body of legislators to attend every year in England. In the case of the Canadian and Australian houses, therefore, there should be selected the number of their members they would be entitled to in proportion to their populations. Canada's proportion in such case would be 81, Australia's 54, and the other self-governing colonies about 28, making 821 members in all. These colonial members would be chosen by their respective legislatures, and not directly by the people ; both in order to preserve unimpaired the power and dignity of the Colonial Houses, and because it is in the highest degree important that harmony should reign between the two legislatures. In order however to prevent the controlling party in the Colonial Parliament from electing the Imperial members entirely from its own ranks, a scheme of proportional representation, such as Mr. Blake has suggested for the protection of minorities in Parliamentary elections, should be adopted in the election by the colonial houses of those of their members who should represent their country in the Imperial. The Colonial members would receive an indemnity based upon the time they were necessarily absent from their homes ;—for Canada, say \$2,000 a year, or double what the members of the House of Commons now receive. If however it were found that the duties occupied so much of their time that they had practically to make it their profession, than I should say that salaries of \$5,000 a year, the amount now paid to members of the United States Congress, might with advantage be paid. I would further opine *en passant* that special courses should be provided in our universities for men who intended to present themselves as candidates for election to Parliament, in order to qualify them for the work of legislation.

As to the upper chamber, it would consist of the House of Lords, modified however so as to reduce its English membership to its proper proportion, and of a competent number of members of the Senates of the several colonies. These might be apportioned not in proportion to population, but in proportion to taxation, if there were any difference between the two.

This Parliament would meet once a year in Westminster. Its session would be entirely distinct from that of the English Parliament. The members from the colonies would be carried across the ocean at the government expense. They would have free, absolutely free, telegraphic facilities, during the session of Parliament, for all public and private business, and out of the session for public business. The Executive government would consist of a distinct cabinet, containing representatives from each member of the federation. In case of a dissolution of the Imperial House of Commons,

the English and Colonial Parliaments would be also dissolved, in order that appeal might be made directly to the people. The separate legislatures might however be dissolved when deemed necessary by their respective ministries, their members in the Imperial House retaining office until their successors were elected.

This scheme is a modification in several important particulars of one of those suggested by Mr. Jehu Matthews, of Toronto, in a work—the best I have ever seen on the subject—published some years ago, entitled “A Colonist on the Colonial Question.” One distinction is that the Canadian and other Colonial Parliaments are here recognized in the same way as the present English Parliament, whereas Mr. Matthews contemplated a curtailment of the powers of those, and as I understand it, the election of members of the Imperial House directly by the people of each country.

It would appear at first sight that a house of over eight hundred members would be very large. But with some drawbacks there are great advantages in a large number of representatives. They certainly express the general opinion of the people of the country better than a small number. They can, so to speak, back one another up. The wise man had said, “In the multitude of counsellors there is safety.” And after all when you do come to a large assembly, the practical inconvenience is no greater in a house of 800 or even 1000, than in a house of 658. It would be seldom that all the members would care to be present; when they were, it would be the simplest matter in the world to arrange so that all could hear the speeches and vote. Most of our city churches seat from 1000 to 1200 persons; the Queen’s Hall seats 1129; our Academy of Music accommodates 1200 persons, and one of the theatres in Paris seats 3600. A house of forty could obstruct, a house of a thousand could expedite, business, if so disposed. There were 788 full members, 985 associate and other members,—1773 in all,—at the British Association meeting in Montreal, about 800 of them from the mother country. The principle I have suggested for the representation of Canada in the British Parliament is already recognized in the Constitution of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Dominion; one fourth of the ministers of each presbytery are members of the Assembly for the year.

Nor would the colonial members run great risk of being overborne by the compact vote of the 658 English members, because apart from the spirit of fair play that eminently characterises our nation, the English members are not only divided among the three Kingdoms as above, but are split up into parties. The present house consists of 332 liberals, 242 conservatives and 62 Home Rulers, so that even now the colonial members would easily hold the balance of power, and their proportion would go on increasing with the greater increase of the colonial population.

The objection that such a Parliament would necessitate the absence from home of a large number of our leading men during a considerable portion of the year, seems to be fully met by the pro-

vision that they should have perfect telegraphic facilities. Under such circumstances it would make little difference whether they were a hundred or 3000 or 10,000 miles from home. And the only loss of time would be that actually consumed in the sea voyage of ten days each way for Canadian members, which Sir John A. Macdonald seems to think about the best thing for a public man, after a season of hard work at the seaside\*, and 30 or 35 days for Australians. Now I am sure that a far greater number than 81 from Canada and 54 from Australia go to England every year on business. And surely the management of the affairs of a world wide empire is a business of sufficient magnitude to demand such a sacrifice.

And outside of their parliamentary duties our members would be able to render the country most valuable services. They would be 81 of the very best immigration agents, with a perfect knowledge of the resources of the country. My friend, Mr. Sidney Fisher, M.P. for Brome, in his remarks at the meetings of the British Association in Montreal, on many questions relating to the agricultural and other industries of this country, convinced me of how much valuable work could be done in this way. And in this respect one of the greatest advantages would arise from the membership of French Canadians from this province. London is but a day's journey from Paris. By easy transit these members could cross the channel, mix with the French people, and there pick up and introduce among our people the best ideas of French civilization. And while the French here are tenacious of the preservation of their language, I know of no better way in which this can be done, and made useful to themselves and to their fellow citizens in this country, than by constant and repeated visits of our ablest public men to old France, where the purest French language and ideas prevail. A deputation from the Imperial Parliament consisting largely of French members would be able to negotiate reciprocal trade advantages in a way that is altogether impossible now, for they would have the whole of the markets of the British Empire to offer in exchange for the markets of France. The presence of these members in the British House would form a link that would bind in friendship and alliance the French and English nations, so that fear of a collision would be reduced to a minimum. And we should be able again to sing with its original meaning, now somewhat obscured, the old Crimean war song,

“ May France from England ne’er sever,  
Three cheers for the Red, White and Blue.”

And the absurd prejudice that has prevented the construction of the Channel Tunnel, (which is shared in by Professor Goldwin Smith), would very quickly disappear if we had a French Canadian as Imperial Minister of Public Works. Again, whatever advantage

---

\* Sir John on leaving for England told the reporters that he needed a rest after the hard work he had had at Ottawa and while at Seaside at Riviere du Loup.

we may pretend to have over our French fellow citizens in commercial life, it must be admitted that they rank high as jurists; and I believe that the presence of men like our present Chief Justice on the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the only International Tribunal in the world, would be a source of pride and satisfaction to our people. Indeed, the many advantages arising from such intercourse are very hard to estimate, but they would all tend to raise our nation to the highest position among the nations of the world. And I think, without vanity, I may claim the right to an opinion on this subject of friendly intercourse, having for the last five years been associated with a French Canadian partner to whom I cannot refer but in terms expressive of esteem and affection.

We may turn now to the economic aspect of the problem. And the first question that naturally presents itself is What would be the cost of such a scheme? I know that those who deprecate any consideration of the subject, raise a great hue and cry about the enormous cost of the army and navy, and take the pusillanimous ground that Canada is not going to pay for these when she can get them as at present for nothing. This is no unworthy a sentiment, from a nation seeking national powers, that it seems sufficient to state it broadly to make it contemptible in the eyes of honourable men. I may quote some words from Mr. Gladstone, ferreted out by an opponent of my views from a report of the Colonial Committee in 1859. "No community which is not primarily charged with the ordinary business of its own maintenance and defence, is really or can be a free community. The privileges of freedom and the burdens of freedom are absolutely associated together. To bear the burden is as necessary as to enjoy the privilege, in order to form that character which is the great security of freedom itself."

I assert then that Canada in claiming a share in the highest national powers is prepared on receiving them to assume national responsibilities. Let us see then what these expenses are, bearing in mind, however, that they must be incurred no matter what form our national independence may assume. And I am sure I shall be able to show you that these burdens are small in comparison with the benefits we should derive from the scheme I shall unfold to you in a moment. The British Army and Navy Estimates for 1883-4 were as follows:

Army.....	£14,641,000
Navy .....	9,278,000
Army and Navy Pensions.....	5,947,000
Diplomacy.....	618,000

---

£30,484,000 = \$148,355,000

If apportioned in the same way as representation, according to population, Canada's share would be something less than one-tenth, say about fourteen million dollars.\* This would give an army of

\* A friend of mine, a merchant of Montreal, has suggested that these expenses should rather be apportioned according to the amount of trade of the several countries. If this were the basis, Canada's share would be exactly \$6,000,000.



137,000 men, and a navy of 57,000 seamen and marines. Now I should like to know what sort of an army and navy Canada could maintain as an independent nation for \$14,000,000. Would it be one to cope with the United States? If we look at the United States we find that their corresponding expenditure for the same year was as follows :

Army.....	\$48,911,000
Navy.....	15,283,000
Army and Navy Pensions.....	60,431,000
Diplomacy.....	2,419,000

---

\$127,044,000

If Canada were annexed to the United States her share of this would be say \$12,000,000, and this would give an army of 27,000 men, and a navy of 11,000. In other words, the expense would be six-sevenths, and the strength would be less than one-fifth of that of the British army and navy, without counting the Indian troops, which, exclusive of native troops, bring the number up to 700,000 men, all of which would be available in case of need.

The Imperial charge would then be \$14,000,000. From this would be deducted Canada's present military expenditure of \$1,240,000 paid for volunteers, pensions and mounted police, for which she would receive credit. But the indemnity of members, subsidizing of steamships to carry them across the ocean, and of sub-marine telegraphs for free telegraphing, and other expenses, might make the sum \$14,000,000 in all. How could this be raised ?

The scheme I have the good fortune to present for your consideration is one that perhaps no Canadian or member of any other colony would have ventured to broach. But it is one that has been elaborated by an Englishman in a high position in the statistical branch of the Customs Department of the United Kingdom. I may therefore give it as embodying the ideas of some of those that take a practical view of the question from an English standpoint. It is conceived in a spirit eminently fair to the colonies and in a peculiar degree advantageous to Canada. The gentleman I refer to is Mr. Stephen Bourne, F.S.S., of Wallington, Surrey, who developed it in a paper read before the British Association in Montreal, entitled " The Interdependence of the several portions of the British Empire. It was published at length in the *Montreal Gazette* of 7th October, 1884.

Mr. Bourne's scheme was briefly this. That there should be complete commercial freedom throughout the British Empire. That to provide the colonies with that portion of their revenue that they now derive from duties on imports from the other parts of the Empire, if no other system can be found, a moderate *ad valorem* customs duty should be collected on certain classes of imports, and an equivalent excise duty on the same articles produced in the colony. That free trade or the same minimum revenue impost should be

offered to every nation of the globe. But if any other nation refused to accord us the freedom of its markets, a prohibitive duty should be imposed on its produce, with power to the Government, by order in council, to abolish such duty so soon as that nation was ready to grant us admission to its markets on the same terms as its own subjects or citizens. This would be the most favoured nation clause in commercial treaties. If for a time the colonies were unable to supply one another and the English market, or England to supply the colonies, it would, of course, be necessary provisionally to modify this system, so as to admit the produce of foreign protective nations but only upon payment of a smaller or larger duty, always discriminating in favor of the inhabitants of the Empire.

Let us examine this system in detail, taking it in its less rigorous and more practicable form of something less than total exclusion of foreign produce, though I shall continue to use the word Prohibitive, merely to denote the duty to be imposed. And let us first take up the question of how to raise our revenue, namely the \$14,000,000 required for Imperial purposes, the \$10,000,000 now collected on imports from the United Kingdom, \$1,000,000 on imports from the other colonies, and \$12,000,000 on imports from foreign countries. The total amount of revenue to be raised would thus be in the neighbourhood of \$37,000,000. The first way in which this might be done under Mr. Bourne's scheme is by a revenue customs and excise duty on certain classes of merchandise. This should be imposed on as small a number of articles as possible, consistently with the raising of the revenue. It would be collected, first, on articles imported from the rest of the Empire and from other nations with which free trade relations should have been established; Secondly, On the same articles produced in our own country; and thirdly, In addition to the prohibitive duty, on imports from nations that maintain protective duties against us.

I shall first make the assumption that we should not get free trade from other nations. The total amount of our dutiable Imports in 1883 was something over \$90,000,000. Suppose \$10,000,000 of the same articles produced in Canada. That makes \$100,000,000 out of which our revenue has to be drawn. Of the \$90,000,000, \$48,000,000 was imported from foreign nations. But if we adopt a highly discriminating duty against them, we must expect this amount to be largely reduced: let us say it would fall to \$25,000,000. The balance would be either produced here, or imported from within the Empire. The produce of the Empire would then be \$75,000,000. To yield the necessary revenue then would require an *ad valorem* duty of 30 per cent. on the produce of the Empire, and the same with 30 per cent. additional on imports from foreign nations.

The Budget estimates would them be :

30 per cent. on \$43,000,000 now imported from within the Empire. ....	\$12,900,000	
“ “ “ \$10,000,000 produced in Canada. ....	3,000,000	
“ “ “ \$23,000,000 now imported from foreign countries, but to be produced within the Empire. ....	6,900,000	22,800,000
60 per cent. on \$25,000,000 to be imported from foreign nations. ....	15,000,000	15,000,000
		<u>\$37,800,000*</u>

Our present average rate of duty on dutable imports is 25.29 per cent. The United States rate on dutable imports is 42.646.

We could therefore raise all the revenue we require, including the \$14,000,000 for Imperial purposes, by increasing our rate of duty on imports from the Empire, 4.71 per cent., or from 25.29 to 30 per cent., which is still 12.646 per cent. less than the American rate ; and by raising the duty on imports from nations that refuse us free trade to 60 per cent.

These rates might be considerably reduced, perhaps to 25 and 50 per cent. respectively, by reason of revenue to be derived from certain classes of articles now imported from foreign nations free of duty, but on which under the new system, duties would have to be imposed. This would apply to about \$12,000,000 of the \$19,000,000 free goods now imported from foreign nations, fish, settlers' effects, government stores and certain other articles remaining free.

It might seem as if it would do little to foster our trade with the United Kingdom, if instead of repealing our duties they were maintained at 25 or increased to 30 per cent. But in reality it would give them practically free admission to our markets, because the same duty would be collected also from producers of the same articles here, and in addition to the prohibitive duty of 30 per cent, from foreign protective nations. All the English could demand would be that there should be no discrimination against them in our own favour. And this tax being purely for revenue would be in no way incompatible with free trade. Nor would 60 per cent. duty destroy our trade with foreign countries, because only half of it would be prohibitive, and the rest would be paid also by producers in the Empire.

Another means by which a considerable portion of our revenue might be raised is by an income and property tax, similar in principle to that now in force in Montreal, which I have heard praised by very high economic authorities, provided it be collected impartially. I have examined the lists of persons enumerated in the last census of Canada, as engaged in profitable occupations. They are 1,400,000 in number. A revenue of \$10,000,000 could be collected

---

\* If 6,000,000 only were required for Imperial expenses, a duty of 24 per cent. on British and 48 per cent. on foreign produce, would be more than sufficient.

from these by an income tax of 3 per cent., taking the assessable incomes at a very low valuation,—merchants and manufacturers' incomes being put at \$1000, professional men, innkeepers and gentlemen of private means' (rentiers), at \$500, merchants' clerks and other mercantile men's at \$300, farmers and industrial employees' at \$200, farmers' sons, fishermen, seamen, miners and laborers' at \$100 a year. As an incentive to the due payment of this tax, the Upper Chamber of the Legislature might be made elective, and every tax payer have a right to votes for the members thereof in proportion to the amount of taxes he paid. If this or some such system were adopted, the Customs and Excise duties on the products of the Empire could be reduced to 20 or even to 15 per cent. And it seems to me that it would be a fair division if the \$14,000,000 necessary for our share of Imperial expenses were raised by that means, and \$10,000,000 of the amount required for our own purposes were raised by the property and income tax.

On the other assumption, namely that the United States and other protective nations would not adhere to their protective duties, but would grant us free trade, then I should imagine trade would increase to such an extent that the same rate of duty would raise all the revenue needed. If not, the United States would have to impose internal taxes to raise the revenue they required, and we could adopt the same system of internal taxation as they, in order that neither of us should have any artificial advantage over the other.

Proceeding now to consider the other features of Mr. Bourne's scheme, it at once appear that the advantage to Canada of such a policy as he has outlined would be enormous. And the advantage would be great, whatever the effect produced on protective nations. Nearly all protectionists who have any knowledge of political economy, certainly Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir Leonard Tilly, and the other members of the present Conservative Government of Canada, hold that free trade is the best policy, provided you can get free trade all round. Sir John's formula was reciprocity of trade or reciprocity of tariffs. And he has many times declared, and has placed it on record on the Statute book, that he is willing to enter into reciprocal trade relations with the United States. Free trade with that country is all that we should get by Commercial Union. The objection Canada has to that policy is not that it would increase our trade with them, but that they declare their determination to admit us to their markets only on condition that we place greater restrictions on our trade with all other nations, discriminating even against Free Trade England, taxing English goods double, so as to make up the revenue lost by admitting American goods free; the injustice of which policy is manifest, and our people must never resort to so contemptible an expedient. Now under Mr. Bourne's scheme the United States as well as other nations that have protective tariffs would be given to understand that unless they abolish their protective duties as regards the British Empire, the Empire will



effectually shut them out from her markets, or make them pay a heavy tribute for the benefit of the colonies on all they send into the Empire.

The high tariff now in force in the United States is designed to foster the interests of the Eastern manufactures. But if the Western farmers, who now really control the elections, if the people generally of the United States, were to see that they are about to lose their market for over \$400,000,000 of their yearly produce, or are to be obliged to pay duties to build up their rivals in the colonies of the Empire, is it likely they would continue to submit to such a tariff? Would they see the farmers of the Canadian Northwest getting 90 c. a bushel for wheat, when they could get only 75 cents, without making their influence felt at the polls? I do not think so. The probability is that at the next general election after the declaration of such a policy, the farmers of the west would arise in their might, sweep away the protective tariff, and insist upon giving free trade to the British Empire rather than lose the British markets. It was partly in the hope of coercing the United States into reciprocity that the protective tariff was adopted in Canada. But it is manifest that Canada's trade is not of sufficient magnitude to overturn the policy of that nation, Canada consuming only 5.75 per cent. of the domestic export of the United States, while the English market is by far their best, being 52 per cent. for the British Isles alone, and 61 per cent. for the whole Empire. Germany, which comes next, takes only 8 per cent., and France, the third, less than 7 per cent. (Returns of 1883). England's proportion of the total foreign trade of the United States is shown by the top red line in their Commerce and Navigation volume. The United States are far more dependent on the British markets than the British Empire is on them. For while the American export to the British Isles is 52 per cent. of its total, the export of domestic produce from the United Kingdom to the United States is only 11.45 per cent. of its total; that from the United Kingdom to the British possessions, on the other hand, is 34.93 per cent.

If then the United States were induced to give us free trade, as it is clearly their interest to do, we should then have all the advantages of commercial union, without the accompanying disadvantage of closing our ports to all the other nations of the world. It would be the same with France as with the United States, only perhaps France would decide upon it sooner. The other nations would follow suit, and the grand ideal of universal free trade would be attained.

Suppose, however, that this effect were not produced: suppose that the United States persisted in maintaining their protective duties. What would be the consequence? Canada would then have, for all she now produces in competition with the United States, a monopoly of the English markets. We all know what an advantage this is in the matter of live cattle. What would it be if applied to all her products? Why it is utterly impossible to esti-

mate, almost impossible to conceive it. The United Kingdom now imports from the United States over \$400,000,000 a year, for \$220,000,000 of which she is a competitor of Canada. Thus, of live cattle and sheep, of meat, of wheat, barley and other grains, furs, hides, skins, butter, cheese, agricultural implements, leather and wood manufactures, the U. S. export to England in 1883 was \$210,000,000, the other \$10,000,000 being of a variety of articles; while Canada's total export was \$47,000,000. Now this comparison is with the United States alone. But of the principal articles now imported by England from Canada, England's total import in 1883 was \$700,000,000, of which \$60,000,000 was from Canada and Newfoundland, \$50,000,000 from other colonies, and \$590,000,000 from foreign nations. The exact amounts in sterling are: British North America, £11,970,000; other British possessions, £10,775,000; Total British possessions, £22,745,000, Foreign countries, £118,909,000. Grand total, £141,654,000.

# IMPORTS INTO THE UNITED KINGDOM, 1883,

(In £ sterling, the last three figures omitted.)

Articles.	From British North America.	From other B'sh Possessions.	Total Imports.
Alkali .....	44		81
Animals living: horned cattle.....	1,144	60	9,112
Sheep.....	216		2,518
Bacon and Hams .....	493		10,036
Beef fresh .....	94	5	2,260
and pork salted.....	31	2	1,270
Butter.....	255	13	11,773
Cheese.....	1,264	1	4,890
Corn: Wheat.....	908	6,632	31,454
Oats.....	30	26	5,010
Pease.....	279	17	746
Maize or Indian Corn.....	628	16	10,370
Barley and other.....	12	6	5,741
Wheat flour.....	369	54	12,344
Oatmeal.....	33	1	196
Dye stuffs: Tanning extracts.....	33		473
Fish.....	552	5	2,301
Fruit: apples.....	46	1	553
Lard.....	218		2,247
Leather.....	65	2,498	5,464
Manures: Phosphate of lime and rock.....	66	57	813
Meat, preserved (otherwise than by salting)....	89	534	1,753
Oil: train or blubber.....	190	63	430
Potatoes.....		451	1,585
Skins and Furs.....	190	249	1,301
Wood and timber: hewn.....	1,617	33	4,967
Sawn and split.....	3,012		10,410
Staves.....	62		641
Furniture and house frames.....	34	46	835
	£11,970	£10,775	£141,654

Of the £11,970,000 Newfoundland's share was £415,000, leaving for Canada proper £11,555,000, besides £209,000 of other articles not enumerated above, which makes the total for Canada proper £11,764,000, total for Newfoundland £519,000, for all British North America £12,283,000. We can see then that Canada's market would by such a policy as Mr. Bourne's be increased about tenfold. And it is just such a market that we require for the rapid falling up of our Northwest,—an infinitely better market than the United States can be, because the States have themselves already a large surplus of all we can produce. The best trade is that between countries whose products are dissimilar. It is clear of course that Canada could not all of a sudden produce all this quantity. But India and Australia have already sprung into great wheat growing countries, Australia also produces animals and meat. So all the colonies and free trade countries together could soon supply the English market. Canada however would have an enormous advantage over all the other colonies, being so much nearer the English market, namely 10 days steam passage, as compared with 28 days to Bombay the nearest port in India, 38 to Calcutta, 46 days to Hongkong in China and from 30 to 40 days to Australia. What a stupendous effect this would have on our trade, on our riches! It would be untold millions to us. For every dollar of additional taxation we should have to pay, we would have five, ten, twenty dollars to pay it with.

But to enable Canada to produce this, she must have more people. And this is another thing that England can supply her with. The surplus population of England would pour rapidly into our North west, if it were no longer a colony, but had become an integral part of the Empire. By the influx of a large number of immigrants, we might, in a single year, go a long way towards filling up the gap between our capability of production and the requirements of the English market. Put a hundred thousand English farmers into the north west in the spring, and in the fall they would have abundant crops to ship back to England. Now in the past the English have not been to the extent they should, an emigrating people. Contrary to what is generally supposed, there is a comparatively small number of Englishmen or Scotchmen in the United States. According to the last American Census, the total number of inhabitants who had been born in England and Wales was 745,000 drawn from a population in England of over 25,000,000; 170,000 born in Scotland, drawn from a population of over 3,500,000, making 915,000 from Great Britain. The Irish on the other hand have been more largely an emigrating people; of those in the United States born in Ireland, there were 1,854,000, from a population in Ireland of slightly over 5,000,000.

Even now for the English and Scotch, the attractive force of the colonies is much greater than that of the United States; for while an American population of 50,000,000 has drawn only 915,000, or less than 2 per cent, a Canadian, population of 4,500,000 has drawn 284,000, or 6.33 per cent, and a population of 900,000 in Victoria,

the most populous of the Australian colonies, has drawn 201,000 or 22 per cent.. I have not been able to get the census statistics of the other Australian colonies, but from other sources of information, obtained through the kindness of Mr. Macmaster M.P., from the Parliamentary library at Ottawa, I have been able to estimate that the net emigration of English and Scotch to Australia, during the 31 years from 1853 to 1883 has been 25.24 per cent. of their present population. The reverse of this holds true for the Irish emigrants, but let us hope that under the new regime of governing Ireland on the principles of equity and justice, their warm and loyal affections may be united to our great Empire, as firmly as those of the English and Scotch. As an emigration plan then Mr. Bourne's is one of the most magnificent that could be devised.

And what policy would be such a mine of wealth to our great railways? To bring the produce of our North West to the seaboard at Montreal would almost overtax the carrying powers of the Canadian Pacific Railway. They would very soon begin to pay good dividends. Instead of being handicapped by their great transcontinental rivals, they would have the best trade of the country. And if they were wise in not overcharging the farmers, they might retain their trade for many years. Possibly in course of time, so great would be the export, that another outlet would have to be sought; and the Hudson's Bay route would be opened up. For like Sir Richard Temple, I believe that the Hudson's Bay route is a possibility. If the Hudson's Bay Company have been able to navigate it for a hundred years, with little wooden sailing ships, surely specially built iron steamships would be able to. Undoubtedly by that time, also, and perhaps, if rumour speaks true, long before, the tea trade of China and Japan will have sought this as the shortest and best line to Europe. The Grand Trunk also would find its traffic, both inward and outward, enormously increased. For the rich province of Ontario will supply almost unlimited traffic to this great railway, when once restrictions at the seaboard are minimised, and imports and exports pass back and forward as freely as the products of this country; and possibly the new Bonaventure Station might be built! While our shipping both in the Province of Quebec and in the Maritime Provinces, would be vastly stimulated. Becoming part of Britannia, we would like Britannia, rule the waves.

But I shall be told our manufactures would be ruined, that we should be turned into a purely agricultural community, that the cities would disappear from the face of the earth. Well I am not going into the question as to which is the more desirable population, a rural or an urban. I would not discriminate against either, but let each have fair play, and allow people to follow their natural bent. But I do not think in a country like Canada with a northwest such as we have to open up, it is wise to discourage the farmers. I propose however to show that Canadian manufactures would not die, but that they would be manifestly benefited by the policy I am now advocating. I assert that by far the larger number of Canadian



manufactures have nothing to fear from the manufacturers of England, that the great bulk of manufactures therefore would be actually benefitted by a policy of free trade with England, and prohibition against the United States. This will appear in two ways. First, if under the old tariff, the United States were able to compete with England, in any manufacture for which we have equal natural facilities with the United States, Canada, upon the United States being shut out from competition, would be able to compete with England. This may not apply to cotton in which the United States have the raw material closer at hand, nor possibly to some kinds of hardware so far as their production in the United States depends upon the supply of iron in Pennsylvania. Though in the latter case, if, as I am informed is the case, the reason we bought our axes, chisels and other edge tools from the States, was not that they were cheaper than the same classes of articles produced in England, but because they were of a pattern that the English manufacturers did not produce, in that case Canada would be well able to compete with England. For English makers are sometimes slow at adopting a new pattern, but manufacturers in Canada could adopt and have adopted these. And with iron still imported from England cheaper than it can be produced in Pennsylvania (in spite of a single transaction to the contrary), we should be able to hold our own. Here then is a list of manufactured goods, in which under the old tariff the United States competed with England, in some supplying a larger in others a smaller quantity. And it will be remembered that there was no discrimination against either. These are taken from the returns for 1879, and include only articles whose import exceeded \$100,000, and only those that I believe are now manufactured in Canada.

IMPORTS INTO CANADA, YEAR ENDING 30th JUNE, 1879.

<i>Articles.</i>	<i>From United States.</i>	<i>From United Kingdom.</i>
Refined Sugar.....	3,000,000	1,100,000
Hardware .....	1,345,000	391,000
Cotton Jeans.....	1,013,000	1,535,000
Manufactures .....	945,000	1,779,000
Bleach'd & Unbleach'd	647,000	256,000
Small wares.....	649,000	1,242,000
Sugar, Low grades.....	470,000	74,000
Hats and caps.....	421,000	225,000
Wood manufac's N.E.S.	274,000	24,000
Pianos .....	273,000	14,000
Iron Castings and stoves.	248,000	44,000
Furniture.....	237,000	10,000
Coal, Bituminous.....	223,000	111,000
Boots and Shoes.....	178,000	15,000
Tobacco .....	177,000	16,000
Cotton Clothing.....	169,000	145,000
Paper .....	156,000	32,000
Drugs.....	146,600	191,000
Leather .....	131,000	72,000
Wool manufactures.....	124,000	4,230,000
Sailcloth.....	124,000	40,000
Fancy Goods .....	117,000	404,000
Straw hats.....	105,000	96,000
Carriages.....	103,000	3,000
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$11,275,000	\$12,049,000

If then Canada could manufacture \$11,000,000 of manufactured goods that were formerly imported from the United States, that would certainly give an impetus to certain branches of trade.

But there is another way in which we can arrive at the effect that would be produced upon our manufactures by free trade with England and prohibition against the United States. Taking the list of our manufacturing industries given in the new Census, we find that 60 per cent. of all industries employing more than 2,000 hands were the following : Saw mills, Boots and Shoes, Carriage making, Preserved food, Flour and grist mills, Cabinet and furniture, Carpenters and Joiners, Tanneries, Shipyards, Agricultural Implements, Tobacco, Cooperage, Harness and saddlery, Sash, door and blind factories, Shingle-making and Cheese factories,—these giving employment to 127,000 out of 155,000. They have nothing to fear from English, and they would certainly be benefited by exclusion of American competition. Again 17 per cent. more were engaged in the following : Blacksmithing, Dressmaking, Printing, Brick and tile making, Bakeries and Limekilns ; which employ 36,000 more. These I believe would not be injuriously affected by free trade with England. The two make together 163,000 out of 210,000, or 77 per cent. The same percentage would hold good for the minor industries,—those employing a smaller number of hands. The total industrial employees were 255,000 of which 77 per cent. is 196,000. These I claim would gain. Even the others, though they would have to face English competition, would have cheaper raw material and machinery than they have now, and would have the protection afforded by the cost of carriage from England to Canada. I think therefore I am right in saying that the only class that could in any way suffer, would be a small fraction of Hot house Protegees, whose industries should never have been established in the country, as we do not possess natural facilities for carrying them on profitably.

But I go further and say that our Canadian manufactures would be actually stimulated, to supply the English market with a great deal that is now supplied by the United States. The United States now send to England \$22,500,000 of the following articles : Agricultural Implements, Carriages, Boots and shoes and other leather manufactures, butter, cheese, preserved meats, Sewing machines, Furniture and other wood ware. I have taken only the largest classes, but there are many other small manufactures of which the same is true.

To sum up then, if the United States were induced ~~to~~ <sup>by</sup> the policy indicated, to give us free trade, we would have a market of 50,000,000 in addition to the other markets of the world. If they were not, we should have a monopoly of a market of 307,000,000 persons in our own Empire, for our Agricultural, Animal, Forest, Fish and Mineral produce, and for certain classes of manufactures. Sixty per cent. of our manufactures would be stimulated, 77 per cent. would be beneficially affected if at all, and the rest would have cheaper raw material. This would indeed be literally millions

upon millions to the wealth of Canada. I cannot pretend to estimate it,—it would be limited only by the very utmost degree of our producing power. In short then looking at the matter in every light, Canada has a great deal to gain by the acceptance of this scheme.

But is England likely to adopt this policy? I venture to say that it is likely. If once attention be closely drawn to the number, value and extent of her colonial possessions, she would adopt any policy that would secure them permanently to her. There are a thousand reasons why she should; and the subject has only to be agitated and discussed to bring this out. It is, in fact, the only way in which she can remain a first class power. We shall of course be told that England is committed to free trade, that nothing will induce her to depart from it. Well these general assumptions are really of very little value. I have yet to learn that England is irrevocably committed to anything. One thing is certain: England knows that however good a thing her free trade policy has been, it is only half as good as universal free trade would be. And the very hope of securing universal free trade, apart from the Colonial question altogether, might go a long way towards inducing her to adopt this policy. There is no doubt that England desires universal free trade. It is true some croakers say that in that event England would lose a great deal of the cotton trade with China and Japan, in favour of the United States. But I do not believe it. So long as she has her colonies she must have her splendid mercantile marine. And so long as she has her commercial fleet, it will be impossible for any nation to dislodge her from foreign markets, and particularly for a nation that has destroyed its shipping so that only 16.3 p.c. of its own commerce is carried in its own ships. It will long continue cheaper to transport raw cotton by water to England, and by water from England to the East, than by rail to the manufacturers of the Eastern States, and by rail to the Pacific coast, and thence by sea to China and Japan. And if the United States could compete with England she certainly could not compete with British India, which is a cotton-growing country where labour is and will remain infinitely cheaper than in America, and which is only twelve days water transit from China. Indeed to suppose that England will lose her foreign trade is as chimerical as the scare got up a few years ago, that her coal mines would become exhausted. It was found on looking into the latter question, that they probably would, but it would take some thousands if not millions of years for it to happen. And I think Englishmen have been able to sleep comfortably under the prospect. But after all this is low ground to take. The truth is that mankind would be benefited if obstructions to trade and intercourse between all nations were removed. And it is one of the chief recommendations of the policy I am now advocating that it would afford one of the strongest inducements to all nations to take the fetters off their intercourse with one another.

The question really is How would England be affected if the protective nations did not adopt that alternative, if they maintained their protective tariffs. Well, in this case the benefit would undoubtedly be primarily to the colonies. But looking at this question purely from an English standpoint, would it not itself abundantly repay her? We know that with no discrimination in their favour, already trade with the colonies advances much more rapidly than trade with foreign countries, and possess elements of permanency that the latter does not. The exports to foreign countries in 1855 were £87,000,000, in 1882, £214,000,000, an advance of 246 per cent., the exports to the colonies in 1855 were £28,000,000 in 1882, £92,000,000, an advance of 328 per cent. Again the colonies are a much more valuable market per head of population. The following nations are her largest foreign customers, and I shall give the exports to each of them in 1882, per head of their respective populations, placing the produce of the United Kingdom in the first column, and the total export in the second :

FOREIGN COUNTRIES.	Per HEAD.		PER HEAD.	
	IMPORT	PROD. U. K.	TOTAL	FROM U. K.
United States.....	£0.59	.	.	£0.74
Germany.....	0.41	.	.	0.67
France.....	0.46	.	.	0.79
Holland.....	2.25	.	.	3.89
Belgium.....	1.46	.	.	2.73
Russia.....	0.05	.	.	0.08
Italy.....	0.23	.	.	0.26
Spain.....	0.22	.	.	0.29
COLONIES.				
Channel Islands .....	6.57	.	.	8.94
Canada.....	2.10	.	.	3.31
Newfoundland.....	3.28	.	.	3.74
South Africa, Natal.....	3.74	.	.	4.06
Cape of Good Hope....	8.32	.	.	8.95
Australia.....	9.23	.	.	10.36

It will be seen, then, that the lowest of the colonies, which I am sorry to say is Canada, is more than three times as good a customer, relatively to population, as the United States; that the colonies generally are from three to twelve times as good customers as England's three largest foreign customers; and that the only foreign countries that compare with the colonies are Holland and Belgium, which are almost free trade countries, Holland's import duties being insignificant, and Belgium's very low, and one or other of these really including Switzerland, whose population should have been taken into account, but has not. If, therefore, trade with the colonies were properly fostered, it would take but little time for it to equal, and even to exceed, foreign trade. Again, the colonies situated in every quarter of the globe are, for the most part, new countries, with immense undeveloped resources. If, then, British enterprise were diverted from foreign fields, and directed to the colonies, the possibilities of the expansion of their trade, their wealth, are absolutely unlimited. And this could only be done if the people of these



colonies were brought officially into the closest connexion with the capitalists and people of the mother country.

It may nevertheless be true that, for a limited time, the price of imported food into England would slightly increase. To the vast majority of the people this would entail but slight convenience, and that only temporary, and would be in some measure offset by a repeal of the present duties on tea, coffee and cocoa, imported from the colonies, which are pretty heavy; and the question is merely whether they are willing to put up with such inconvenience for the accomplishment of the object contemplated by this policy. The English people have been called upon to make great sacrifices before now, and for less worthy objects than to build up their great Empire. They have submitted to heavy burdens of taxation for the carrying on of costly wars. Could they not bear something in the interest of their fellow-subjects beyond the seas? It would be only the investment of a prudent man, sure to make a handsome return in the future. In building up their colonies they would be providing a sure market for their future products; not trusting blindly to the chance good-will or enlightenment of foreign nations for the removal of restrictions on trade, but with the certainty that no restrictions would ever be imposed. They would, in fact, be laying up for themselves and for their children a heritage richer and more glorious than they could look forward to in any other way.

And at the same time as they were doing this, they would be wiping out their national debt out of the enormous revenues this system would bring into the coffers of the government. So that by the time other nations would have begun to think about combinations to offset their power, they would be relieved of the great bulk of their present taxation, and would have all the greater advantage over all competitors.

But what is supposed to attach the people of England peculiarly to their system of free trade, is that in the past it prevented and relieved distress. Suppose, however, they can be satisfied that there is another and a better way in which distress may be prevented and relieved. I have said that the majority of the people might have some temporary inconvenience. But it is possible there might be a fraction of the people upon whom it would bring a measure almost of distress. Well it is in the interest of these people more than any others that this scheme may be said to have been devised. For, for those who are so ill off, so near starvation point, that even a slight increase in the price of food would bring them into distress, surely the sooner they leave their present homes and take up a homestead in one of the British colonies, the better for all concerned. In this view, a slight hardship would be a blessing to mankind; for it would induce those who are now on the very verge of indigence to remove to those parts of the world where they are most wanted, and thus relieve the overpressure of population at home. For it is an essential part of a scheme for the consolidation of the Empire, that no distress would be permitted. Emigration (then it would be merely

Migration) would be a stimulation<sup>ed</sup> to a degree that would effectually remove any possibility of hunger and want at home. And the removal of these people would simply be to provide a better market for all England produces, in a country where they would be able to make something with which to pay for what they consumed. And we have seen that every Canadian colonist is worth three Americans to the English producer.

Nor must we forget that the interests of some of the chief industries of the United Kingdom are identical with our own in this matter; and especially the agricultural interest. We know with how much difficulty the members of the Anti-Corn Law League persuaded the Agriculturists of England to consent to the abolition of duties on farm produce. We could therefore count on the hearty co-operation of the farmers of the mother country, who form, I need not tell you, one of the most important elements in the population. And this is the class to whom an extension of the suffrage is just being given by the new Franchise Bill. By the assimilation of the County and Borough Franchise, 2,000,000 voters chiefly in the rural constituencies, have been added to the Parliamentary electors. And these are the men whose interests are enlisted on our side in the endeavour, until we can get reciprocity from other nations, to keep the British markets for the British people.

But I think we may with confidence leave the English side of the question to the English people. I believe it has to come to this, that an Imperial Federation must at the outset be accompanied with an Imperial Customs Union. And I have no fear but that when the English people take hold seriously of this question, and make up their minds that the thing should be done, the difficulties will rapidly vanish away.

And now but one word in closing: Lord Roseberry in addressing the Trades Union Congress at Aberdeen, told them that the Franchise bill was of small importance in comparison with the question of Imperial federation. In the same way I am convinced that the question of free trade itself is of small importance in comparison with this. Mr. Bourne announced himself a free trader. I am myself a free trader,—even, in the elegant language of Canadian politics, a jug handle free trader,—believing that economically free trade is the best system even if adopted only on one side. But just as there are times in domestic life when considerations of economy are of secondary importance, so in national affairs, there are occasions when economic considerations sink into comparative insignificance. And this is one of these cases. I believe indeed that in the long run it will be true economic policy for England to establish a world wide consolidated Empire, even though at the expense of some immediate sacrifice. For every interest of civilization will be greatly promoted by a grand far-reaching scheme by which so many of what must be the great nations of the future shall be brought into relations with one another of the closest and most enduring character. And we Canadians shall be recreant to our trust if we do not do our

part to forward so grand, so sublime a scheme : if we pursue the shortsighted policy of allowing to slip from our grasp the joint heritage we have with all our fellow subjects, in possessions that dot every sea, that extend vastly over every continent, spreading the exalted civilization of our race into the remotest corners of the wor'd.

After the close of the address, SIR WILLIAM DAWSON in moving a vote of thanks, observed that the subject of federation had been agitated for at least forty years, though, in his opinion, never with such prospects of success as now, when the facilities for rapid communication had removed the only insuperable obstacle that once stood in the way of a closer union than at present exists of the different parts of the Empire. He also said it should be remembered that the British empire was held together not so much by Britons themselves, for they formed a minority of its subjects, as by British principles, the three most potent of which are British freedom, British energy, and British administrative purity. In concluding he paid a graceful compliment to the society and its president, remarking that, though the latter had said McGill ought to have a faculty for the training of statesmen, the existence of the society rendered the establishment of such a faculty unnecessary.



